Echo State Condition at the Critical Point[1]

Norbert Michael Mayer[2]

Department of Electrical Engineering
and
Advanced Institute of Manufacturing with High-tech Innovations (AIM-HI),
National Chung Cheng University, Chia-Yi,
Taiwan
mikemayer@ccu.edu.tw

arXiv:1411.6757v8 [cs.NE] 26 Oct 2016

[1] This manuscript has been posted at arxiv.org [1]

[2] The author declares that he has no conflict of interest.

Abstract

Recurrent networks with transfer functions that fulfill the Lipschitz continuity $L = 1$ may be echo state networks if certain limitations on the recurrent connectivity are applied. It has been shown that it is sufficient if the largest singular value of the recurrent connectivity S is smaller than 1. The main achievement of this paper is a proof under which conditions the network is an echo state network even if $S = 1$. It turns out that in this critical case the exact shape of the transfer function plays a decisive role in determining whether the network still fulfills the echo state condition. In addition, several examples with one neuron networks are outlined to illustrate effects of critical connectivity. Moreover, within the manuscript a mathematical definition for a critical echo state network is suggested.

Structured abstract

Background. Recurrent networks that have transfer functions that fulfill the Lipschitz continuity with $L = 1$, may be echo state networks if certain limitations on the recurrent connectivity are applied. On one hand, it has been shown that it is sufficient if the largest singular value of the recurrent connectivity S is smaller than 1. On the other hand if the absolute largest eigenvalue of the connectivity being larger than one implies that the network is not an echo state network. The range between these two values leaves a non-zero gap for which the echo state feature has been unknown so far.

Methods. The results of the article have been achieved by symbolic and numerical analysis, as outlined in the paper.

Results. The main achievement of this paper is a proof under which conditions the network is an echo state network even if $S = 1$. It turns out that in this critical case the exact shape of the transfer function plays a decisive role in determining whether the network still fulfills the echo state condition. In addition, several intuitive examples with one neuron networks are outlined to illustrate effects of critical connectivity. Finally, several additional ideas related to critical ESNs and their definition have been added to the manuscript.

Keywords: Reservoir computing, uniformly state contracting networks, power law

Notations in formulas

$s(M)$		vector of singular values of matrix M
$\mathbf{S}$		diagonal matrix of singular values
S		largest singular value of a matrix
$\lambda(M)$		vector of eigenvalues
$\theta(.)$	$\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$	transcendental transfer function
θ', $\dot{\theta}$		its derivative
$\mathbf{w}^{in}$	$\mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$	input matrix
$\mathbf{W}$	$\mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$	recurrent transfer matrix
$\mathbf{w}^{out}$	$\mathbb{R}^{k \times m}$	output matrix
$\mathbf{u}_t$	$\mathbb{R}^n$	input time series
$\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}$		complete infinite input time series
$\mathbf{x}_t$	$\mathbb{R}^k$	hidden layer states
$\mathbf{y}_t$	$\mathbb{R}^k$	alternative hidden layer states to check convergence
$\mathbf{o}_t$		training set
$\tilde{\mathbf{o}_t}$		trained network output
$d(.,.)$	$\|.\|_2$	distance measure that is used to check convergence
$\mathbf{F}(.)$		vector of a set of linearly independent, non-linear functions
$\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}}$	$\in \mathcal{F}$	dynamics of the network with regard to the input
$\mathcal{F}_{crit}$		all dynamics that show power law forgetting
$q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},t}$		time series related to forgetting in ESNs
q_t		time series variable
$\phi_1()$		cover function to estimate contraction in a 1 neuron net
$\phi_k()$		dto. for a k neuron network
η, κ, γ		const parameters of both ϕ_1 and ϕ_k
$\Lambda_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}}$		Lyapunov exponent of a neural network wrt. an input time series $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}$

1 Introduction

What is a good reservoir with regard to particular stationary input statistics? This has been a fundamental question for research in this field since the invention of the two representative methods of reservoir computing, Echo State Networks (ESNs) [2] and Liquid State Machines (LSMs) [3]. The answer seems to be: A good reservoir is a reservoir, from which states for a time span of the input history can be reconstructed that is as long as possible. More precisely, they should be reconstructed in a way that is sufficiently accurate in order to predict the training output. In other words, a good reservoir is a reservoir that has a good memory of the input history.

There have been efforts to quantify the quality of the memory of the reservoir. Most common is the *'memory capacity'* (MC) according to Jäger's definition (see citation above). However, MC has several drawbacks: For example, it is not directly compatible to a Shannon information based measure. Still, it illustrates that ESNs are relatively tightly restricted in the way that the upper limit of the MC is equal to the number of hidden layer neurons. So the capabilities of the network increase with the number of neurons.

One more important limiting factor with regard to the reservoir memory is the strength of the recurrent connectivity. According to the echo state condition, the nature of the reservoir requires that the maximum S of its eigenvalues is smaller than 1. This seems always to result in a exponential forgetting of previous states. Thus, forgetting is independent from the input statistics but instead has to be pre-determined and is due to the design of the reservoir dynamics.

In comparison, state of the art memory compression methods work in a different way: Here the necessary memory is basically determined in the way that the predictability of the next input out of the previous inputs is calculated. If the next input is highly predictable (i.e. very likely) only a few new bits are necessary in order to encode it[1].

The ultimate target of the present work is to find a way to organize reservoirs as recurrent filters with a memory compression feature. In order to bring concepts of data compression into the field of reservoir computing and in order to project as much as possible of the input history to the limit size reservoir, principles of memory compression have to be transferred into reservoir computing. However, the reservoir computing techniques that are analogous to classic memory compression have not been identified so far.

In order to proceed, there are several important aspects. First, it is necessary to get rid of the intrinsic time scale of forgetting that is induced by $S < 1$. The solution is to set $S = 1$. However, to really create a network with scale-free forgetting (i.e. a network that forgets slower than exponential) is more tedious. Steps toward this direction have been made by going near the "edge of chaos" [4] or even further where the network may not be an echo state network for all possible input sequences but instead just around some permissible inputs[5]. However, numerical analysis shows that these approaches still all forget exponentially fast.

---

[1] e.g. Huffmann code. For sake of simplicity of the argument lossless compression is considered. The prefect comparison would be lossy compression methods.

Recently, a first reservoir has been published that is able to forget slower than exponential, i.e. in a power law fashion [6]. Here, networks with $S = 1$ were used. In addition, modified transfer functions were applied. Finally, learning methods within the reservoir were applied in order to redirect the response of the network, after receiving a likely input, to certain values that correspond to special feature points on the transfer function. Thus, not only memory compression also prediction has also been implemented into the network.
Strictly, networks with $S = 1$ are not covered by the initial proof of Jäger for the echo state condition. One important purpose of this paper is to close this gap and to complete Jäger's proof in this sense. The other purpose is to motivate the principles of [6] in as simple as possible examples and thus to increase the resulting insight.
The paper is organized in the following way: The following sections are intended to motivate the the concept of critical neural networks and how they are related to memory compression. This part is relatively large in size because it seems important to argue for principle value of critical ESNs. Sect. 2 introduces the concept of reservoir computing and also defines important variables for the following sections. Sect. 3 uses the concept of Lyapunov coefficients in order to suggest a clear definition for critical reservoirs which can be used analytically on candidate reservoirs. Sect. 4 introduces echo state networks (ESNs). Sect. 5 describes how critical one neuron reservoirs can be designed and also introduces the concept of extending to large networks. Sect. 6 explains why the critical ESNs are not covered by Jäger's proof. The actual proof for the echo state condition can be found in sect. 7. Certain aspects of the proof have been transferred to the appendix.

2 Motivation

The simplest way to train with data in a supervised learning paradigm is to interpolate data (cf. for example [7]). Thus, for a time series of input data $\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that forms an input sequence $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\infty$ and a corresponding output data $\mathbf{o}_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ one can choose a vector of non-linear, linearly independent functions $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}_t) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^k$ and a transfer matrix $\mathbf{w}^{out} : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^m$. Then, one can define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_t &= \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}_t) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{o}_t} &= \mathbf{w}^{out}\mathbf{x}_t. \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbf{w}^{out}$ can be calculated by linear regression, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{w}^{out} = (AA')^{-1}(AB), \tag{1}$$

where the rectangular matrices $A = [\mathbf{x}_{0,}\mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_t]$ and $B = [\mathbf{o}_0, \mathbf{o}_1 \dots \mathbf{o}_t]$ are composed from the data of the training set and A' is the transpose of A. Further, one can use a single transcendental function $\theta(.)$, such that

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}_t) = \theta(\mathbf{w}^{in}\mathbf{u}_t), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{w}^{in} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is a matrix in which each line consists of a unique vector and $\theta(.)$ is defined in the Matlab fashion; so the function is applied to each entry of vector separately. Linear independence of the components of $\mathbf{F}$ can then be guaranteed if the column vectors of $\mathbf{w}^{in}$ are linearly independent. Practically, linear independence can be assumed if the entries of $\mathbf{w}^{in}$ are chosen randomly from a continuous set and $k \geq n$. The disadvantage of the pure interpolation method with regard to time series is that the input history, that is $\mathbf{u}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_{t-2}, \ldots \mathbf{u}_0$, has no impact on training the current output $\tilde{\mathbf{o}_t}$. Thus, if a relation between previous inputs and current outputs exists, that relation cannot be learned.

2.1 Reservoir computing

Different from eq. 1, a **reservoir** in the sense of reservoir computing [8,9,10] can be defined as

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t). \tag{3}$$

The recursive update function adds several new aspects to the interpolation that is outlined in eq. 1:

1. The new function turns the interpolation into a dynamical system:

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t) = \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\infty}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}),^2 \tag{4}$$

   where the notation $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\infty}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1})$ is intended to illustrate the character of the particular discrete time, deterministic dynamical system and the fact that each possible time series $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\infty$ defines a specific set of dynamics.
   The superset $\mathcal{F}$ over all possible $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\infty$,

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\infty} \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\infty}$$

   may be called the reservoir dynamics. Thus, $\mathcal{F}$ covers all possible dynamics of a particular reservoir with regard to any time series of input vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Note that this way of looking into the dynamics of reservoirs is non-standard. Rather the standard approach is to interpret the reservoir as a non-autonomous dynamical system and then to formalize the system accordingly [5]. For the present work, the turn towards standard dynamical systems has been chosen because here the relevant methodology is well established and the above mentioned formalization appears sufficient for all purposes of this work.
2. It is now possible to account for information from a time series' past in order to calculate the appropriate output.

One important question is if the regression step in the previous section, and thus the interpolation, works at all for the recursive definition in eq. 3. Jäger showed ([2] pp. 43, [11]) that the regression is applicable, i.e. the **echo state condition** is fulfilled, if

[2] For obvious reasons one may call $\mathbf{F}$ an input driven system.

and only if the network is uniformly state contracting. Uniformly state contraction is defined in the following.
Assume an infinite stimulus sequence $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty} = \{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and two random initial internal states of the system $\mathbf{x}_0$ and $\mathbf{y}_0$. To both initial states $\mathbf{x}_0$ and $\mathbf{y}_0$ the sequences $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^{\infty} = \{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}^{\infty} = \{\mathbf{y}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ can be respectively assigned.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_t &= \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t) = \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}) \\ \mathbf{y}_t &= \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t) = \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}}(\mathbf{y}_{t-1}) \\ q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},t} &= d(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{y}_t), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}}$ is another series and $d(.,.)$ shall be a distance measure using the square norm[3].
Then the system $\mathcal{F}$ is uniformly state contracting if independent from $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}$ and for any initial state ($\mathbf{x}_0$,$\mathbf{y}_0$) and all real values $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a finite $\tau_{\mathcal{F}}(\epsilon) < \infty$ for which

$$\max_{\mathcal{F}} q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},t} \leq \epsilon \tag{6}$$

for all $t \geq \tau_{\mathcal{F}}$.
Another way to look at the echo state condition is that the network $\mathcal{F}$ behaves in a time invariant manner, in the way that some finite subsequence in a input time series will roughly result always in the same outcome. In other words

$$\mathbf{x}_{\Delta t+t_0} \approx \mathbf{y}_{\Delta t+t_0}$$

independent of t_0, $\mathbf{x}_{t_0}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{t_0}$ and if Δt is sufficiently large.

3 Lyapunov exponents for system analysis and an analytic definition of criticality

Lyapunov analysis is a method to analyze predictability versus instability of a dynamical system (compare [12]). More precisely, it measures exponential stability.
In the context of non-autonomous systems, one may define the Lyapunov exponent as

$$\Lambda_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}} = \lim_{|q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},t=0}| \to 0} \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \frac{|q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},t}|}{|q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},0}|},$$

Thus, if

$$q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},t} \overset{\propto}{\sim} \exp(bt),$$

then $\Lambda_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}}$ approximates b and thus measures the exponent of exponential decay. For power law decays the Lyapunov exponent is always zero. [4]
In order to define criticality, we use the following definition:

[3] Other metric measures may be applicable, though.

[4] For example one may try $q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},t} = \frac{1}{t+1}$.

Definition. A reservoir that is uniformly state contracting shall be called **critical** if at least for one input sequence $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}$ there is at least one Lyapunov exponent $\Lambda_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}}$ that is zero.

4 Echo State Networks

The echo state network (ESN) is an implementation of reservoir dynamics as outlined in eq. 3. Like other reservoir computing approaches, the system is intended to resemble the dynamics of a biological inspired recurrent neural network. The dynamics can be described for discrete time-steps t, with the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{lin,t} &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \mathbf{w}^{in}\mathbf{u}_t \\ \mathbf{x}_t &= \theta\left(\mathbf{x}_{lin,t}\right) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{o}_t} &= \mathbf{w}^{out}\mathbf{x}_{t.} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

With regard to the transfer function $\theta(.)$, it shall be assumed that it is continuous, differentiable, transcendental and monotonically increasing with the limit $1 \geq \theta'(.) \geq 0$, which is compatible with the requirement that $\theta(.)$ fulfills the Lipschitz continuity with $L = 1$. Jäger's approach uses random matrices for $\mathbf{W}$ and $\mathbf{w}^{in}$, learning is restricted to the output layer $\mathbf{w}^{out}$. The learning (i.e., training $\mathbf{o}_t$) can be performed by linear regression (cf. eq. 1).
The ESN fulfills the echo state condition (i.e. it is uniformly state contracting) if certain restrictions on the connectivity of the recurrent layer apply, for which one can name a necessary and a sufficient condition:

- C1 A network has echo states only if

$$1 > \max \mathrm{abs}(\lambda(\mathbf{W})), \tag{8}$$

  i.e. the absolute value of the biggest eigenvalue of $\mathbf{W}$ is below 1.

A sufficient condition is:

- C2 Jäger named here initially

$$1 > \max s(\mathbf{W}), \tag{9}$$

  where s is the vector of singular values of the matrix $\mathbf{W}$. However, a closer sufficient condition has been found in [13]. Thus, it is already sufficient to find a full rank matrix D for which

$$1 > \max s(D\mathbf{W}D^{-1}). \tag{10}$$

[14] found another formulation of the same constraint: *The network with internal weight matrix* $\mathbf{W}$ *satisfies the echo state property for any input if W is diagonally Schur stable, i.e. there exists a diagonal* $P > 0$ *such that* $W^T PW - P$ *is negative definite.*
Apart from the requirement that a reservoir has to be uniformly state contracting, the learning process itself is not of interest in the scope of this paper.

5 Critical reservoirs with regard to the input statistics $\bar{\mathrm{u}}^{\infty}$

Various ideas on what types of reservoirs work better than others have been brought up. In [6] the following idea has been introduced: One can try to keep the memories of the input history in the network as long as possible. The principle idea was to tune the network's recurrent connectivity to a level where the convergence for a subset of $\mathcal{F}_{crit} \in \mathcal{F}$ with regard to eq. 6 is

$$q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}_{crit},t} \overset{\propto}{\sim} t^{a} \tag{11}$$

rather than

$$q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty},t} \overset{\propto}{\sim} b^{t}, \tag{12}$$

where $a < 0$ and $0 < b < 1$ are system specific values, i.e., they depend on $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}}$.
A network according to eq. 11 is still an ESN since it fullfils the ESC. Still, forgetting of initial states is not bound to a certain time scale. Remnants of information can –under certain circumstances– remain for virtually infinite long times within the network given that not too much unpredictable new input enters the network. Lyapunov analysis of a time series according to eq. 11 would result in zero, Lyapunov analysis of eq. 12 in result different from zero.
In ESNs forgetting according to the power law of eq. 11 for a input times $q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}_{crit},t}$ is achievable if the following constraints are fulfilled (compare considerations in [6]):

– The recurrent connectivity $\mathbf{W}$, the input connectivity $\mathbf{w}^{in}$ of the ESN and the transfer function $\theta(.)$ have to be arranged in a way that if the ESN is fed with $q_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^{\infty}_{crit},t}$ one approximates

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \left|\dot{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{lin,t)}\right| = 1,$$

Thus, the aim of the training is

$$\left|\dot{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{lin,t)}\right| = 1. \tag{13}$$

Since the ESN has to fulfill the Lipschitz continuity with $L = 1$, the points where $\dot{\theta} = 1$ have to be inflection points of the transfer function. In the following these inflection points shall be called epi-critical points (ECPs).
– The recurrent connectivity of the network is to be designed in a way that the largest absolute eigenvalue and the largest singular value of $\mathbf{W}$ both are equal to one. This can be done by using normal matrices for $\mathbf{W}$ (see sect. 5.5).

5.1 Transfer functions

The standard transfer function that is widely used in ESNs and other types of neural networks is the sigmoid function, i.e.,

$$\theta(x) = \mathsf{tanh}(x), . \tag{14}$$

The sigmoid transfer function has one ECP $\mathit{\Pi}_0 = 0$.



Fig. 1: Variant possible transfer functions with interesting features regarding criticality. On the left side tanh has only one epi-critical point. Eq. 15 is graphed on the right side. Here, an infinite set of epi-critical points $n\pi + \pi/2$ that are all positioned along the line $y = x/2$. In both graphs green dots indicate epi-critical points, green curves a smooth interpolation between those points, and the blue line indicates the particular transfer function itself.

As a second possible transfer function, one may consider

$$\theta(x) = 0.5x - 0.25\sin(2x). \tag{15}$$

Here, one has a infinite set of ECPs at $\Pi_i = (n + 0.5) \times \pi$. It is important to have more than one ECP in the transfer functions, which is evident if one considers eq. 13 and the sigmoid transfer function $\tanh(.)$. [5]
Since the expected input should redirect the linear states of the network to the epi-critical points, in the case of $\theta()$ all linear states should be

$$\mathbf{x}_{lin,t} = 0.$$

That type of trained network cannot infer information from the past to the present for the expected input, which significantly restricts its capabilities. One can see that from

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \tanh(\mathbf{x}_{lin,t}) = 0.$$

The next iteration yields

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \tanh(\mathbf{w}^{\text{in}}\mathbf{u}_t),$$

which again, after training would require

$$0 = \mathbf{w}^{in}\mathbf{u}_t.$$

Thus, the network can only anticipate the same input at all time steps. Further considerations can be found in [6].

[5] Confer also considerations in [6].



Fig. 2: Tailored transfer function where the epi-critical points can be organized in an adaptive way and follow a transcendental function (which has certain advantages to the examples depicted in fig. 1, in blue). Green dots indicate epi-critical points, the green curve is a smooth interpolation between those points, and the blue line indicates the particular transfer function itself. Note that the green curve is a tanh and thus a transcendental function.

In the case of eq. 15 the maximal derivative $\theta'(x)$ is 1 at $x = \pi(n + 1/2)$, where n is an integer number (confer fig. 1). Here the main advantage is that there exists an infinite set of epi-critical points. However, all these points are positioned along the linear function $y = x/2$. This setting still significantly restricts the training of $\mathcal{F}_{crit}$ Here one can consider the polynomial with the lowest possible rank (cf. the green line in fig. 1, left side) that interpolates between the epi-critical points (in the following called an epi-critical transfer function). In the case of eq. 15 the epi-critical transfer function is a linear function, i.e.

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = 0.5\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}_t + 0.5\mathbf{w}^{in}\mathbf{u}_{t.}$$

Thus, the effective dynamics of the trained reservoir on the expected input time series is -if this is possible- the dynamics of a linear network. This results in a very restricted set of trainable time series.

As an alternative, one could consider also a transcendental function for the interpolation between the points, such as depicted in fig. 2. The true transfer function (blue line in fig. 2 can be constructed in the following way Around a set of defined epi-critical points Π_i, define as either

$$\theta(x) = \mathsf{tanh}(x - \Pi_i) + \mathsf{tanh}(\Pi_i)$$

or

$$\theta(x) = \mathsf{tanh}(x).$$

This is one conceptional suggestion for further investigations. The result is a transfer function with the epi-critical points Π_i and 0. The epi-critical transfer in this case is a tanh function.

5.2 Examples using a single neuron as reservoir

In order to illustrate previous considerations, one may go into practical examples where a single neuron represents a reservoir. First one can consider a neuron with tanh as a transfer function along with a single input unit

$$x_{t+1} = \mathsf{tanh}(bx_t + u_t), \tag{16}$$

where in order to achieve a critical network $|b|$ has to be equal to 1 ,i.e., the network that exactly fulfills the boundary condition. From previous consideration one knows that $\mathcal{F}_{crit}$ has the dynamics that results from $u_t = 0$ as an input. In this case the only fixed-point of the dynamics is $x_t = 0$, which is also the epi-critical point when $|a| = 1$.
Power law forgetting: Starting from the two initial values $x_0 = 0$ and say $y_0 = 0.01$, one can see that the two networks converge in a power law manner to zero. On the other hand, a linear network

$$x_{t+1} = bx_t + u_t$$

with the same initial conditions as above is such as the dynamics of the 2 networks never converge (independent of u_t). Instead, the difference between $x_0 = 0$ and say $y_0 = 0.01$s stays the same forever. Thus, the network behavior in the the case of $b = 1$ depends on the nature of the transfer function. For all other values of b, both transfer functions result qualitatively in the same behavior in dependence on b: either they diverge or they converge exponentially. Since $b = 1$ is also the border between convergence and divergence and thus the border between uniformly state contracting networks and not uniformly state contracting networks the case of $b = 1$ may be called a critical point of the dynamical system, in a similar manner as a critical point at the transition from ordered dynamics to instability. In the following it is intended to extend rules for different transfer functions, where different transfer functions result in the critical point in uniformly state contracting networks and where this is not the case.
As a final preliminary remark, it has to be emphasized that a network being uniformly state contracting means that the states are contracting for any kind of input u_t. It does not mean that for any kind of input the contraction follows a power law. In fact, for all input settings $u_t \neq 0$ the contraction is exponential for the neuron of eq. 16, even in the critical case ($|b| = 1$).

5.3 Single neuron network example with alternating input and power law forgetting

As outlined above, for practical purposes the sigmoid function, i.e., $\theta = tanh()$, is not useful for critical networks because the only critical state occurs when total activity of such a network is null. In that case it is not possible to transfer information about the input history. The reason is illustrated in the following example, where instead of a sigmoid function other types of transfer functions are used.



Fig. 3: Depicted is the Lyapunov exponent for the example system of eq. 17 for different values of b. At $b = 1$ the Lyapunov exponent crosses zero. At this point all types of linear analysis fail. The point marks the border between networks that fulfills the ESP and those that are not. So, this point is the called critical point. Further analysis shows that the point itself belongs to the area with ESP. All results from fig. 4 and 5 are drawn from the point where the Lyapunov exponent is zero.

So, the one neuron network

$$x_{t+1} = \theta(-bx_t + (2-b)u_t) \tag{17}$$

with a constant b, the transfer function of eq. 15 and the expected alternating input $u_t = (-1)^t\pi/4$, has an attractor state when also x_t is alternating with $x_t = (-1)^t\pi/4$ independent from b. Thus, $u_t = (-1)^t\pi/4$ shall be interpreted as the expected input which directs the activity of the network exactly to where $\theta' = 1$, and thus induces a critical dynamic $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^\infty} = \mathcal{F}_{crit}$.
It is now interesting to investigate the convergence behavior for different values of b considering differing starting values for internal states x_t and y_t. Fig. 3 depicts the resulting different Lyapunov exponents for one neuron networks with different values of b. One can see that –not surprisingly– the Lyapunov exponent for $b = 1$ is zero. This is the critical point that marks the transition from order to instability in the system and at the same time the transition from ESC to non-ESC.
In the following the same network at $b = 1$ is investigated. Some unexpected input let the network jump out of the attractor. If the input afterwards continues as expected the network slowly returns to the attractor state in a power law fashion. Thus,

$$d(x_t, y_t) \lessapprox t^{-a},$$

where y_t represents the undisturbed time series, and a is a constant value. Note that x_t contains all information of the network history and that the network was simulated



Fig. 4: Results from a dynamics defined in eq. 17, with $b = 1$ and different types on input $\mathbf{u}_t$. Difference of two networks of one neuron in the hidden layer, that have perceived different input at iteration one. Depicted here is the decay of the difference of the state in the recurrent layer if both networks receive the same and expected (alternating) input (in dark blue). The pale curves are data from following graphs embedded for comparison. One can see that the difference function (blue) follows a power law and pertains for longer than 64 iterations.

using IEEE 754-2008 double precision variables, which have a memory size of 64 bit on Intel architecture computers. Although floating point variables are organized in a complicated way of three parts, the sign, exponent and mantissa, it is clear that the total reservoir capacity cannot exceed those 64 bits, which means in the limit a reservoir of one neuron cannot remember more than 64 binary i.i.d. random numbers.
Thus, at latest after 64 iterations with unexpected input the difference between x_t and y_t should be annihilated. Thus, if both networks x_t and y_t receive the same unexpected input that is of the same magnitude, the difference between the x_t and y_t should reach virtually 0 within 64 iterations. The consideration can be tested by setting the input

$$u_t = \pi/4 \times \mathrm{rand},$$

where rand is an i.i.d. random list of +1s and -1s, that produces a representative of $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^\infty} \neq \mathcal{F}_{crit}$. Fig. 4 and fig. 5 depict results from simulations, where after one iteration when two networks receive different input, both networks receive again the same input, depicted is again the development of the difference between both networks $d(x_t, y_t)$ versus the number of iterations. The graphs appear in a double logarithmic fashion, so power law decays appear as straight lines. One can see that the networks that receive



Fig. 5: Complementary data for fig. 4: Left: Decay if both networks receive the same but irregular (i.i.d random) input (different colors are used for different trials). The difference vanishes much faster than in the left case. Finally the difference becomes and stays null, which is out of a logarithmic scale. Thus, later iterations are not depicted anymore. Right: Depicted here is the same data as at the left, however in a double-logarithmic plot. The data forms a straight line, which indicates an exponential decay.

alternating, i.e. the expected input, pertains the difference for very long time spans (that exceed 64 iterations). On the other hand, if the network input for both networks is identical but i.i.d random and of the same order of magnitude as the expected input, the difference vanishes within 64 iterations.

The network distinguishes regular from irregular input. Memories of irregular events pertain for long time in the network, provided the following input is regular again. How a reservoir can be trained to anticipate certain input statistics has been discussed [6]. Additional solutions to this problem are subject to further investigations.

5.4 Relation to *'near edge of chaos'* approaches

It is a common experience that – in spite of given theoretical limits for the ESCs – the recurrent connectivity can be significantly higher than $S = 1$ for many practical input statistic. Those over-tuned ESNs in many cases show a much better performance than those that actually obey Jaeger's initial limit ESC. So, recently researchers came up with theoretical insights with regard to ESCs that are subject to a network and a particular input statistic [5]. In the scope of this work, instead of defining the ESC for a network the ESC is always defined as related to a network and an input statistic. Also, similar efforts have been undertaken in the field of so-called liquid state machines.

One may assume that those approaches show similar properties as the one that has been presented here. However, for a good reason those approaches all are called *'near edge of chaos'* approaches. In order to illustrate the problems that arise from those approaches one may consider what happens if those overtuned ESNs are set exactly to the critical point. Here, just for the general understanding one may consider again a one neuron

network and a tanh as a transfer function, so

$$x_{t+1} = \mathsf{tanh}(-bx_t + u_t). \tag{18}$$

Note that the ESC limit outlined above requires that the recurrent connectivity should be $b < 1$. One can now take the input time series from the previous section

$$u_t = (-1)^t \pi/4 \tag{19}$$

Slightly tedious but basically simple calculus results in a critical value of $b \approx 2.344$ for the input time series, where $x_t \approx (-1)^t \times 0.757$. In this situation one can test for the convergence of two slightly different initial conditions and obtain a power law decay of the difference. However, setting up the amplitude of the input just a tiny bit higher is going to result in two diverging time series x_t and y_t. If the conditions of the ESN are chosen to be exactly at the critical point it is possible that a not trained input sequence very close to the trained input sequence turns the ESN in a state where the ESC is not fulfilled anymore (For a related and more detailed discussion with a numerical analysis, confer [15]).
For this reason all the networks have to be chosen at a significant margin towards the edge of instability. That is very different from the approach in the previous section where although the expected input sequence for the network is exactly at the critical point, all other input sequences result in a stable ESN in most cases with exponential forgetting.

5.5 How the one neuron example can be extended to multi neuron networks: Normal Matrices

A normal matrix $\mathbf{W}$ commutes with its own transpose, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^T = \mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W}.$$

For a normal matrix $\mathbf{W}$, it can easily be shown that

$$\max s(\mathbf{W}) = \max \mathrm{abs}(\lambda(\mathbf{W})).$$

These matrices apply to the spectral theorem; the largest absolute eigenvalue is the same as the largest singular value, which makes a clear theoretical separation between networks that are uniformly state contracting and those that are not compatible to the echo state condition. Still, for normal matrices all previously known ES conditions do not determine which of those two groups the critical point[6] itself belongs.
Summarizing, all previous works result in theorems for an **open set** of conditions that are defined by the strict inequalities eqs. (8) and (10). In the closest case, the case of **normal** matrices, when considering the singular condition

$$1 = \max s(\mathbf{W}) = \max \mathrm{abs}(\lambda(\mathbf{W})) \tag{20}$$

[6] Which is a set of Lebesgue measure null.

there is no statement of the above mentioned theorems if the network is uniformly state contracting.
Some simple, preliminary numerical tests reveal that in the case of networks that satisfy to eq. 20 the further development of the network strictly depends on the exact shape of transfer function. Two examples of networks with only one neuron may illustrate the following considerations. Further details can be found in [6].

6 Echo state condition limit with weak contraction

Jäger's sufficient echo state condition (see [2], App. C, p. 41) has strictly been proven only for non-critical systems (largest singular value $S < 1$) and with $\tanh(.)$ as a transfer function. The original proof is based on the fact that $\tanh$ in combination with $S < 1$ is a contraction. In that case Jäger shows an exponential convergence. The starting point of the considerations in this manuscript are experiments where parameter settings with $S = 1$ were used, and where power law convergence had been achieved [6].
The core of all considerations of a sufficient condition is to give a close upper estimate of the distance between two different states y_t and x_t to the next iteration

$$\max_{\bar{\mathbf{u}}^\infty} d(y_{t+1}, x_{t+1}) = \max_{\mathcal{F}} d(\mathcal{F}(y_t), \mathcal{F}(x_t)) \leq \phi_1 \cdot d(y_t, x_t),$$

where the parameter ϕ_1 basically is quantified by the nature of the transfer function and the strength of the connectivity matrix. The estimate has to be good enough that the iterative application of ϕ_1 should result in a convergence to 0:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} [\, \phi_1 \cdot]^t d(y_0, x_0) = 0, \tag{21}$$

This is equivalent to investigating a series q_t with

$$d(y_t, x_t) < q_t = [\, \phi_1 \cdot]^t d(y_0, x_0)$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} q_t = 0, \tag{22}$$

which can prove that the requirement of universal state contraction (cf. eq. 6) is fulfilled. For example, consider the case of a reservoir with one neuron as described in eq. 16. Here the challenge is to find an estimator for ϕ_1

$$\max_{u_t\in\mathbb{R}} d(\theta(by_t + u_t), \theta(bx_t + u_t)) \leq \phi_1 \cdot d(y_t, x_t),$$

where the chosen ϕ_1 still holds the limit in eq. 21. For $|b| < 1$, convergence can be proven easily:

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{u_t\in\mathbb{R}} d(\theta(by_t + u_t), \theta(bx_t + u_t)) \leq \\ &\quad \max_{u_t\in\mathbb{R}} ||by_t + u_t - bx_t - u_t||_2 = \\ &\qquad\qquad |b| \cdot d(y_t, x_t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus for $|b| < 1$, one can easily define $\phi_1 = |b|$. So q_t can be defined as

$$q_t = |b|^t \cdot d(y_0, x_0).$$

So eq. 22 is fulfilled. The convergence is exponential. The arguments so far are analogous to the core of Jäger's proof for the sufficient echo state condition C2 that is restricted to one dimension.
For $|b| = 1$, this argument does not work anymore. Obviously, Jäger's proof is not valid under these circumstances. However, the initial theorem can be extended. As a pre-requisite, one can replace the constant ϕ_1 with a function that depends on q_t as an argument.
So one can try

$$\phi_1(q_t) = 1 - \eta q_t^\kappa,$$

where $\eta > 0$ and $\kappa > 1$ have to be defined appropriately. This works for small values of q_t. However, it is necessary to name a limit for large $q_t > \gamma$. Define

$$\phi_1(z) := \begin{cases} 1 - \eta z^\kappa & \text{if } z < \gamma \\ 1 - \eta\gamma^\kappa & \text{if } z \geq \gamma. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

Three things have to be done to check this cover function:

- First of all, one needs to find out if indeed the cover function ϕ_1 fulfills something like
$$\max_{u_t \in \mathbb{R}} d(\theta(y_t + u_t), \theta(x_t + u_t)) \leq d(y_t, x_t)\phi_1(d(y_t, x_t)).$$
In order to keep the proof compatible with the proof for multiple neurons for this work, one has to chose a slightly different application for ϕ_1,
$$\max_{u_t \in \mathbb{R}} d^2(\theta(y_t + u_t), \theta(x_t + u_t)) \leq d^2(y_t, x_t)\phi_1(d^2(y_t, x_t)),$$
which serves the same purpose and is much more convenient for multiple neurons. In app. C one can find a recipe for this check.
- Second, one has to look for the convergence of
$$q_{t+1} = q_t\, \phi_1(q_t) = q_t\, (1 - \eta q_t^\kappa),$$
when $q_t \leq \gamma$. The analysis is done in app. A.
- Third, one needs to check
$$q_{t+1} = q_t\, \phi_1(q_t) = q_t\, (1 - \eta\gamma^\kappa),$$
as long as $q_t > \gamma$. Since the factor $(1 - \eta\gamma^\kappa)$ is positive, smaller than one and constant, the convergence process is exponential, obviously.

Note that the next section's usage of the cover function differs slightly even through it has the same form as eq. 23.

7 Sufficient condition for a critical ESN

Theorem: If hyperbolic tangent or the function of eq. 15 are used as transfer functions the echo state condition (see eq. 6) is fulfilled even if $S = 1$.
Summary of the proof: As an important precondition, the proof requires that both transfer functions fulfill

$$d(\theta(y_t), \theta(x_t)) \leq d(y_t, x_t)\phi_k(d^2(y_t, x_t)), \tag{24}$$

where $\phi_k(z)$ is defined for a network with k hidden neurons as

$$\phi_k(z) := \begin{cases} 1 - \eta z^\kappa & \text{if } z < \gamma \\ 1 - \eta\gamma^\kappa & \text{if } z \geq \gamma \end{cases}. \tag{25}$$

Here, $1 > \gamma > 0, 1 > \eta > 0$, $\kappa \geq 1$ are constant parameters that are determined by the transfer function and the metric norm $d(.,.) = ||.||_2$
In app. C it is shown that indeed both transfer functions fulfill that requirement. It then remains to prove that in the slowest case we have a convergence in a process with 2 stages. In the first stage, if $d^2(y_t, x_t) > \gamma$ there is a convergence that is faster or equal to an exponential decay. The second stage is a convergence process that is faster or equal to a power law decay.
Proof: Note with regard to the test function ϕ_k:

$$\begin{gathered} \phi_k \leq 1 \\ \forall z, \forall Z : 0 \leq z \leq Z \leftrightarrow \phi_k(z) \geq \phi_k(Z) \\ \forall z, \forall Z : 0 \leq z \leq Z \leftrightarrow Z \times \phi_k(Z) \geq z \times \phi_k(z) \end{gathered}$$

In analogy to Jäger one can check now the contraction between the time step t and $t+1$:

$$\begin{aligned} d^2(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) &= d^2(\theta(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t+1}), \theta(\mathbf{x}_{lin,t+1})) \\ &\leq d^2(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{lin,t+1}) \\ &\quad \times \phi_k(d^2(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{lin,t+1})) \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

One can rewrite

$$\begin{gathered} d^2(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{lin,t+1}) = \\ ||\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}_t + I - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}_t - I||_2^2 = \\ ||\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{x}_t)||_2^2, \end{gathered} \tag{27}$$

where $I = \mathbf{w}^{in}\mathbf{u}_t$. As our next step one can consider that one can decompose the recurrent matrix by using singular value decomposition (SVD) $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{V}^T$. Note that both $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are orthogonal matrices and that $\mathbf{S}$ is diagonal with positive values s_i on the main diagonal. We consider

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{V}^T(\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{x}_t).$$

Because $\mathbf{V}$ is an orthogonal matrix the left side of the equation above is a rotation of the right side and the length $||\mathbf{a}||$ is the same as $||\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{x}_t||$. One can write

$$d^2(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) = \sum_i a_i^2,$$

where a_i are entries of the vector $\mathbf{a}$. Since

$$\mathbf{y}_{lin,t+1} - \mathbf{x}_{lin,t+1} = \mathbf{USa}$$

and $\mathbf{U}$ is again a rotation matrix, one can write

$$d^2(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{lin,t+1}) = \sum_i s_i^2 a_i^2,$$

where s_i is the i-th component of the diagonal matrix $\mathbf{S}$, i.e., the i-th singular value. In the following we define $S = \max_i s_i$ and calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
& d^2(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{lin,t+1}) \times \\
& \phi_k(d^2(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{lin,t+1})) \\
&= (\sum_i s_i^2 a_i^2) \times \phi_k(\sum_i s_i^2 a_i^2) \\
&\leq (S^2 \sum_i a_i^2) \times \phi_k(S^2 \sum_i a_i^2) \\
&\leq (S^2 d^2(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)) \times \phi_k(S^2 d^2(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)) \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

Merging eq. 26 and eq. 28 results in the inequality

$$d(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq S d(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) \times (\phi_k(S^2 d^2(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t))^{0.5}.$$

First, assuming $S < 1$ and since we know $\phi_k \leq 1$, we get an exponential decay

$$d(y_n, x_n) \leq S^t d(x_0, y_0).$$

This case is handled by Jäger's initial proof. With regard to an upper limit of the contraction speed (cf. eq. 6), one can find

$$\tau(\epsilon) = \frac{\log \epsilon - \log(d(y_0, x_0))}{\log S}.$$

If the largest singular value $S > 1$, then for some type of connectivities (normal matrices, see [6]) the largest absolute eigenvalue is also larger than 1 due to the spectral theorem. In this case, the echo state condition is not always fulfilled, which has been shown also by Jäger.
What remains is to check the critical case $S = 1$. Here again one can discuss two different situations (rather two separate phases of the convergence process) separately: If $d^2(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t}, \mathbf{x}_{lin,t}) > \gamma$, we can write the update inequality of eq. 29 as:

$$d^2(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq (1 - \eta\gamma^\kappa) d^2(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t).$$

Thus, for all $\epsilon^2 \geq \gamma$, the slowest decay process can be covered by

$$\tau(\epsilon) = \frac{2\log\epsilon - 2\log(d(y_0, x_0))}{\log(1 - \eta\gamma^\kappa)}.$$

If $\epsilon^2 < \gamma$, then eq. 29 becomes:

$$d^2(\mathbf{y}_{t+1}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq d^2(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)(1 - \eta d(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)^{2\kappa}).$$

One can replace

$$q_t = d^2(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) \tag{29}$$

and again consider the sequence

$$q_{t+1} = q_t(1 - \eta q_t^\kappa),$$

which is discussed in app. A. The result there is that the sequence converges faster than

$$q_*(t) = [\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + q_0^{-\kappa}]^{-1/\kappa}.$$

So,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} q(t) = d^2(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t) = 0 \tag{30}$$

and thus ESC has been proven, QED.
Moreover, one can calculate the upper time limit $\tau(\epsilon)$:

$$\tau(\epsilon) = \frac{\kappa}{\eta}(\epsilon^{-2\kappa} - a_0^{-\kappa}).$$

8 Discussion

The proof shows a network as outlined in sect. 4 is an ESN even if the largest eigenvalue of the recurrent connectivity matrix is equal to 1 and if the transfer function is either eq. 14 or 15. The proof is also extensible to other transfer functions. On the other hand it is obvious that some transfer functions result in networks that are not ESNs. For example a linear transfer function ($\theta(x) = x$) is *not* universal state contracting.
Even if the network is universal state contracting it is not necessarily exponentially universal state contracting. Its rate of convergence might follow a power law in the slowest case. An example of power law forgetting has been shown in the previous section. More examples of preliminary learning have been outlined in [6]. One important target of the present research is to allow for a kind of memory compression in the reservoir, by letting only the unpredicted input enter the reservoir.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The author declares that he has no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval

This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by the author.

Acknowledgements

The Nation Science Council and the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan provided the budget for our laboratory. Also thanks go to AIM-HI for various ways of support.

References

1. N. M. Mayer. Echo state condition at the critical point. URL, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.6757`, 2015.
2. Herbert Jäger. The echo state approach to analysing and training recurrent neural networks with an erratum note. In *GMD Report 148, GMD German National Research Insitute for Computer Science*, 2001, 2010. http://www.gmd.de/People/Herbert.Jaeger/Publications.html.
3. Wolfgang Maas, Thomas Natschläger, and H. Markram. Real-time computing without stable states: A new framework for neural computation based on perturbations. In *NeuroCOLT Technical Report*, 2001. NC-TR-01-113.
4. Joschka Boedecker, Oliver Obst, Joseph Lizier, N. Mayer, and Minoru Asada. Information processing in echo state networks at the edge of chaos. *Theory in Biosciences*, 131:205–213, 2012.
5. G Manjunath and Herbert Jaeger. Echo state property linked to an input: Exploring a fundamental characteristic of recurrent neural networks. *Neural computation*, 25(3):671–696, 2013.
6. N. M. Mayer. Adaptive critical reservoirs with power law forgetting of unexpected input events. *Neural Computation*, 27, May 2015.
7. Andrew Ng. CS 229 Machine Learning, UC Stanford. URL, `http://cs229.stanford.edu/notes/cs229-notes1.pdf`, 2014.
8. Herbert Jaeger, Wolfgang Maass, and Jose Principe. Special issue on echo state networks and liquid state machines. *Neural Networks*, 20(3):287–289, 2007.
9. Mantas Lukoševičius and Herbert Jaeger. Reservoir computing approaches to recurrent neural network training. *Computer Science Review*, 3(3):127–149, 2009.
10. Benjamin Schrauwen, David Verstraeten, and Jan Van Campenhout. An overview of reservoir computing: theory, applications and implementations. In *Proceedings of the 15th European symposium on artificial neural networks*. Citeseer, 2007.
11. Herbert Jäger. Adaptive nonlinear system identification with echo state networks. In *Proc. of NIPS 2002*, 2003. AA14.
12. Gilles Wainrib and Mathieu N Galtier. A local echo state property through the largest lyapunov exponent. *Neural Networks*, 2016.
13. Michael Buechner and Peter Young. A Tighter Bound for the Echo State Property. *IEEE Transaction on Neural Networks*, 17(3):820–824, 2006.
14. I. B. Yildiz, H. Jäger, and S. J. Kiebel. Re-visiting the echo state property. *Neural Networks*, 35:1–20, 2012.
15. N. Michael Mayer. Critical echo state networks that anticipate input using adaptive transfer functions. 2016.

Appendix

A Analyze $q_{t+1} = q_t(1 - \eta q_t^{\kappa})$

We can consider the sequence q_t:

$$q_{t+1} = q_t(1 - \eta q_t^{\kappa}). \tag{31}$$

Convergence can be analyzed in the following way:

$$\Delta q_t = q_{t+1} - q_t = -\eta q_t^{\kappa+1}. \tag{32}$$

Thus, the series q_{t+1} can be written

$$q_{t+1} = \sum_{t'<t} \Delta q_{t'}$$

Thus one comes up with the following discrete formula

$$\Delta q_{t'} = -\eta q_{t'}^{\kappa+1}. \tag{33}$$

Since $\kappa \geq 1$ and $1 > \eta > 0$ convergence towards null is obvious here. In addition since the right side of eq. 33 is decreasing continuously it is obvious that it is converging fast than the corresponding solution of the differential equation for a function q_*:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}q_*}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\eta q_*^{\kappa+1},$$

Which is easily solvable to:

$$-\frac{1}{\kappa\eta} q_*^{-\kappa} = t + C,$$

where C is the integration constant. From this solution, by setting $a_0 = a_*(0)$, one can derive

$$q_*(t) = [\frac{\eta}{\kappa} t + q_0^{-\kappa}]^{-1/\kappa}.$$

Note that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} q_* = 0.$$

Simple algebraic considerations show that $q_*(t)$ covers the sequence q_t. For a strict proof see app. B.
Thus,

$$q_{*,t} \geq q_t$$

for all $t > 0$ if

$$q_{*,0} = q_0$$

So, the sequences $q_{*,t}$ and q_t converge to zero.

B Sequence $q_{*,t}$ covers up sequence q_t

In the following, identical definitions to sect. 6 are used. One can start from the statement

$$-\frac{\eta}{\kappa} \geq -\eta. \tag{34}$$

Since $\eta \geq 0$ and $\kappa \geq 1$, it can easily be seen that the inequality is fulfilled for any combination of s, η and κ. One can now extend the numerator and denominator of the right side by $(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C)$ and add also $(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C)$ to both sides of the inequality. Here and in the following C is defined as

$$C = q_0^{-\kappa} \geq 1. \tag{35}$$

One obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C - \frac{\eta}{\kappa} \geq \\ (\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C) - (\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C)\frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

A rearrangement of the right side results in

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C - \frac{\eta}{\kappa} \geq \\ (\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C) \times (1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}). \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

One can add $\frac{\eta}{\kappa}$ to both sides and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C \geq \\ \frac{s\eta}{\kappa} + (\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C) \times (1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{s\eta}{\kappa}t + C}). \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Now, one can use the fact that

$$1 \geq 1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}\right)^{\kappa}$$

and

$$\frac{\eta}{\kappa} \geq \frac{\eta}{\kappa} \times \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}\right) \geq \frac{\eta}{\kappa} \times \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}\right)^{\kappa}$$

and thus rewrite inequality eq.38 as

$$\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C \geq (\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C + \frac{\eta}{\kappa}) \times \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}\right)$$

and finally arrive at

$$\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C\right) \geq \left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C + \frac{\eta}{\kappa}\right) \times \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}\right)^{\kappa}.$$

One can multiply both sides with $\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C + \frac{\eta}{\kappa}\right)^{-1} \times \left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C\right)^{-1}$. So,

$$\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C + \frac{\eta}{\kappa}\right)^{-1} \geq \left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C\right)^{-1} \times \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}\right)^{\kappa}.$$

Taking the kth root on both sides one gets

$$\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C + \frac{\eta}{\kappa}\right)^{-1/\kappa} \geq \left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C\right)^{-1/\kappa} \times \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C}\right).$$

One can rearrange the inequality to:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C + \frac{\eta}{\kappa}\right)^{-1/\kappa} &\geq \left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C\right)^{-1/\kappa} \times \left(1 - \eta\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C\right)^{-1}\right) \\
\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}(t+1) + C\right)^{-1/\kappa} &\geq \left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C\right)^{-1/\kappa} \times \\
&\quad \left(1 - \eta\left(\left(\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + C\right)^{-1/\kappa}\right)^{\kappa}\right) \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the definitions of $q_{*,t}$ and $q_{*,t+1}$, i.e.

$$q^*(t) = [\frac{\eta}{\kappa}t + q_0^{-\kappa}]^{-1/\kappa},$$

one has finally

$$q_{*,t+1} \geq q_{*,t} \times (1 - \eta(q_{*,t})^{\kappa}). \qquad (40)$$

proven as a true statement. Thus,

$$q_{*,t} \geq q_t \geq d(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)$$

for all $t > 0$ if

$$q_{*,0} = q_0 = d(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{x}_0).$$

Thus, the positive definite sequence $q_{*,t}$ covers $d(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)$.

C Weak contraction with the present transfer function

In this appendix a test function of the form of eq. 25, is verified for the function of eq. 15 and hyperbolic tangent. Within this section we test the following values

$$\eta = \frac{1}{48 \times n^2}, \gamma = \frac{1}{2} \text{and} \kappa = 2, \tag{41}$$

for both transfer functions and square norm ($||.||_2$), and n-neurons. In order to derive these values, one can start by considering linear responses $||\mathbf{y}_{lin,t} - \mathbf{x}_{lin,t}||$ and the final value $||\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{x}_t||$ within one single neuron as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_t &= \theta(\mathbf{y}_{lin,t}) \\ \mathbf{x}_t &= \theta(\mathbf{x}_{lin,t}). \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

We can define

$$\begin{aligned} y_{lin,t,i} &= \Delta_i + \zeta_i \\ x_{lin,t,i} &= \zeta_i \\ x_{t,i} - y_{t,i} &= \delta_i \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where i is the index of the particular hidden layer neuron. Note that

$$||\mathbf{y}_{lin,t} - \mathbf{x}_{lint,t}||^2 = \sum_i \Delta_i^2, \;\; ||\mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{x}_t||^2 = \sum_i \delta_i^2.$$

C.1 One neuron transfer

In this section considerations are restricted to the case in which one has only one neuron in the hidden layer. For sake of simplicity, the subscript index i is left out in the following considerations.
Setting in the definitions of eq. 43 into the square of eq. 24 and for a single neuron and for any ζ we get

$$\Delta^2 \, \phi_1(\Delta^2) \geq \left(\theta(\Delta + \zeta) - \theta(\zeta)\right)^2.$$

Thus, it suffices to consider

$$\phi_1(\Delta^2) \geq \max_{\zeta} \omega(\Delta, \zeta), \tag{44}$$

where

$$\omega(\Delta, \zeta) = \left(\frac{\theta(\Delta + \zeta) - \theta(\zeta)}{\Delta} \right)^2$$

The $\max_\zeta$ can be found by basic analysis. Extremal points can be found as solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \omega \;\; &= \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \left[\left(\frac{\theta(\Delta + \zeta) - \theta(\zeta)}{\Delta} \right)^2 \right] \;\; &= \\ \frac{2(\theta(\Delta + \zeta) - \theta(\zeta)) \times (\dot{\theta}(\Delta + \zeta) - \dot{\theta}(\zeta))}{\Delta^2} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

This can only be fulfilled if

$$\dot{\theta}(\Delta + \zeta) - \dot{\theta}(\zeta) = 0$$

Since for both suggested transfer functions θ' is an even function one gets $\zeta = -z/2$ as the extremal point. Fundamental analysis shows that this point in both cases is a maximum. Thus, requiring

$$\phi_1(\Delta^2) \geq \left[\frac{2\theta(\Delta/2)}{\Delta}\right]^2 \tag{46}$$

also would satisfy eq. 44.
Numerically one can find parameters for ϕ_1 that are $\eta = 1/48$ and $\kappa = 2$ of $\phi_1(z)$ as in eq. 41.
For $\Delta^2 > \gamma$ is suffices to check if

$$\frac{4\mathsf{tanh}^2(\Delta/2)}{\Delta^2} \leq 1 - \eta\gamma^\kappa$$

First the inequality is fulfilled for $\Delta^2 = \gamma$. Since the left side of the equation above is strict monotonously falling for positive z, it is also fulfilled for all values $\Delta^2 > \gamma$.
Analogous considerations lead to the same parameters to cover up the transfer function from eq. 15.

C.2 Multi-neuron parameters

For several neurons one has to consider the variational problem of all possible combinations of values of Δ_i. One can start from the proven relation from the previous section

$$\delta_i^2 \leq \Delta_i^2 \phi_1\left(\Delta_i^2\right)$$

Thus,

$$\sum_i \delta_i^2 \leq \sum_i \left(\Delta_i^2 \phi_1\left(\Delta_i^2\right)\right),$$

implying that

$$\sum_i \left(\Delta_i^2 \phi_1\left(\Delta_i^2\right)\right) \leq \sum_i \Delta_i^2 - \Delta_{max}^2 + \Delta_{max}^2 \phi_1(\Delta_{max}^2), \tag{47}$$

where $\Delta_{max}^2 = \max_i \Delta_i^2$. The smallest possible Δ_{max}^2 is

$$\frac{\sum_i \Delta_i^2}{n},$$

Substituting into eq. 47, we get

$$\sum_i \Delta_i^2 - \Delta_{max}^2 + \Delta_{max}^2 \phi_1(\Delta_{max}^2) \leq$$

$$\sum_i \Delta_i^2 - \frac{\sum_i \Delta_i^2}{n} + \frac{\sum_i \Delta_i^2}{n} \phi_1(\frac{\sum_i \Delta_i^2}{n}) =$$

$$(\sum_i \Delta_i^2) \phi_1(\frac{\sum_i \Delta_i^2}{n^2}).$$

Thus, the following inequality (which is equivalent to eq. 24) is fulfilled

$$\sum_i \delta_i^2 \leq \left(\sum_i \Delta_i^2 \right) \phi_k \left(\sum_i \Delta_i^2 \right),$$

if ϕ_k is defined as

$$\phi_k(x) = \phi_1 \left(\frac{x}{n^2} \right).$$

Thus, the parameters from eqs. 41 fulfill the inequality of eq. 24.